

REMARKS

Claims 21 and 22 have been amended for clarification purposes only. Claims 1-21 are pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 21-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY MATSUDA (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,211,649 B1)(previously cited):

The present invention as recited in claim 21, for example, recites a communication controller. The communication controller comprises a communication device, and a computer device connected to the communication device via a universal serial bus (USB), the computer device sending a communication request signal peculiar to the USB, to the communication device via the USB.

The communication controller further comprises a wireless telephone connected to the communication device via a communication line, the communication device disconnecting the communication line when the communication request signal is not detected by the communication device within a predetermined amount of time.

Matsuda fails to disclose "a computer device connected to the communication device via a universal serial bus (USB), the computer device sending a communication request signal peculiar to the USB, to the communication device via the USB, and a wireless telephone connected to the communication device via a communication line, the communication device disconnecting the communication line when the communication request signal is not detected by the communication device within a predetermined amount of time," as recited in claim 21.

Instead, FIGS. 1 and 3 of Matsuda disclose a mobile telephone connected with a PC, whereby a protection control switch of a charging unit initially stops the supply of power to a voltage control unit of the USB cable to prevent damage of the batter of the mobile phone by overvoltage in the starting to supply power to the mobile phone (see column 3, lines 34-42). After a predetermined period of time, when the supplied power is stabilized, the protection control switch starts to supply the power to the voltage control unit. The voltage control unit regulates the supplied power to a power of a predetermined voltage suitable for the battery of the mobile phone, the charge control unit of the USB cable detects the voltage, and the temperature, the detect whether each value is within a predetermined threshold. If the values exceed the predetermined threshold, the charge control unit transmits an interrupt signal to the protection control switch (see column 3, lines 43-63).

Matsuda does not teach or suggest “disconnecting the communication line when the communication request signal is not detected by the communication device within a predetermined amount of time,” as recited in claim 21. Instead, Matsuda focuses on interrupting voltage supply to the mobile phone when a voltage and a measured temperature exceed a predetermined threshold. Further, in Matsuda, the USB cable connection is disconnected to discontinue the charging of the battery when the voltage of the battery is stabilized. However, in the present invention, the communication device disconnects the communication line, not the USB cable connection, when the communication request signal communication request signal that is peculiar to the USB is not detected by the communication device within a predetermined amount of time.

Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the teaching of Matsuda is fundamentally different from that of the present invention. That is, transmitting and interrupting voltage supply for charging a mobile phone battery via a PC in Matsuda is not comparable to “sending a communication request signal peculiar to the USB...and disconnecting the communication line when the communication request signal is not detected by the communication device within a predetermined amount of time” as recited in claim 21.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 21, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3-15, 17-20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MATSUDA IN VIEW OF TSAI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,101,076; HEREINAFTER “TSAI”) (newly cited):

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Matsuda fail to disclose “disconnecting means for disconnecting a line that is being used for communication when the signal peculiar to the USB is not detected by the detecting means within a predetermined time,” as recited in claim 1. However, the Examiner asserts that Tsai discloses this feature.

The Applicants respectfully submit that both Matsuda and Tsai relate to the connection and disconnection between the USB host and the USB device.

Tsai discloses an electromagnetic safety (EMS) enhancement circuit for a USB system which can, in the event of the USB device being disconnected from a USB interface due to electromagnetic interferences, simulate an unplugging and replugging action for the USB device so as to reconnect the USB device to the USB interface to ensure continuous operation (see

column 1, lines 14-21).

Thus, the teaching of Tsai is also fundamentally different from that of the present invention. That is, purpose of Tsai is to allow continuous operation of the USB device in the event of a disconnection from the USB interface due to electromagnetic interferences.

Therefore, the combination of Matsuda and Tsai fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2 AND 16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MATSUDA IN VIEW OF TSAI AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF KUBO ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,671,814; HEREINAFTER “KUBO”)(previously cited):

Claims 2 and 16 depend from independent claims 1 and 15, respectively, therefore the comments above in section II, may be applied here.

Further, Kubo relates to power supply control from a USB host with respect to a USB device.

Thus, Kubo fails to make up for the deficiencies of Matsuda and Tsai, as mentioned above. Therefore, the combination of Matsuda, Tsai and Kubo fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention.

IV. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Sept 16, 2005

By: Deidre M. Davis
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501r